

The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday (Columbus Day, Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day). A volume usually contains twenty-six or twenty-seven issues.

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States.

Place of publication, Barnard College, New York, New York.
Editor, Charles Knapp (Barnard College, Columbia University).
Address, 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York, New York.

VOLUME XXIX, No. 15

MONDAY, MARCH 2, 1936

WHOLE No. 787

SOME INNOVATIONS OF EURIPIDES

Why did Aristophanes satirize Euripides? I should say that Aristophanes's attacks are the surest proof of Euripides's immense popularity during his life time. Satire is sure to fail of its point unless the object of satire is well known. Being well known almost implies a certain degree of popularity. Tradition testifies to Socrates's interest in Euripides. The sophistic element in his plays would naturally appeal to a large group in the population, notably the young and those of advanced thought. The conservative would, indeed, have a different view of the case. Aristophanes may have been conservative or he may not. But the important fact is that Euripides offered an excellent target for his humor. It seems to me that Euripides's innovations, far from being a drawback, were the definite reason for his popularity. Aristophanes's attacks merely indicate the extent of the interest aroused by certain new elements in the drama which Euripides had introduced. Aristophanes had, of course, a close acquaintance with Euripides's plays. I have no doubt that he entertained admiration of a sort for Euripides. We remember that the god of tragedy, Dionysus, in the Frogs, had been reading the Andromeda and was smitten with a great desire to see Euripides. Euripides was well known. His plays were, it is clear, read. Aristophanes could not have parodied them as he did without the intimate sort of knowledge which comes from having the written text before one. In the Acharnians he parodies the Telephus thirteen years after its first presentation. Evidently it must have created a sensation. I feel sure it must have been familiar to the audience as well as to Aristophanes, either through the medium of books or through repeated presentation¹.

Professor Flickinger says²:

... <Euripides> is usually stated to have won five victories, but some notices report fifteen. Possibly we are to understand that he won ten Lenaeon victories. His comparative lack of success while living thus stands in striking contrast to his popularity subsequently.

Let us rather understand that his success was greater than is commonly thought, that Aristophanes's strictures have obscured in some fashion the real popularity he enjoyed in his life time.

What was the source of this popularity? Let us say his innovations. What were the innovations? Aristophanes satirizes particularly Euripides's realism in theatrical presentation, and his presentation on the

stage of love and of sex problems. These things evidently created a sensation. They were new. They stirred the indignation of some, the admiration of others. But they brought recognition and popularity.

Suppose we try to explain more clearly the nature of some of Euripides's innovations. Let us glance at the ragged hero; let us examine a type of plot which seems to have been a favorite with him; let us study his realism.

I. THE RAGGED HERO

Aristophanes may laugh at Euripides's ragged hero, but for all that the ragged hero has a distinguished line of ancestors. Moreover, it may be well to remember that Aristophanes parodies Homer. But who would care to say that any disrespect was therefore aimed at the epic poet? I think it may fairly be said that Aristophanes parodies Euripides not because he really dislikes him, but because the innovations of the tragic poet are striking enough to attract the attention of both populace and humorist. It may seem a trifle contradictory to say that the ragged hero has a long and distinguished ancestry, and on the other hand to speak of him as a striking innovation. But the truth is that the type is old, while the method of presentation is new. Euripides merely made the type extremely real. He saw the dramatic possibilities of a hero disguised as a beggar and realized them to the full. The modern theater-goer would scarcely be shocked by such a hero. But to the ancient Greek he was no doubt a novelty, an innovation in the technique of the theater.

The type was very old. We remember the story told by Helen in Homer, *Odyssey* 4.240-264, how Odysseus came into the wide-wayed city of Troy disguised as a beggar and how she recognized him. That Euripides was acquainted with this story is quite evident, for, in the Hecuba, Hecuba refers to the time when Odysseus came as a spy into Ilium in unseemly garb, with drops of blood falling down his cheeks. In Merry and Riddell's edition³ of the *Odyssey* further reference is made to the similar story of Zopyrus, who pretended to be a deserter from the Persian camp and so helped Darius to take Babylon (Herodotus 3.154), and also to the story of Peisistratus, how he wounded himself in order to obtain a guard for himself (Herodotus 1.59). Need we doubt that Euripides was acquainted with the history of Herodotus, and with its pretended deserters and its travel tales, and knew their effectiveness? Of course others, too, knew them. So why the great scandal when Euripides presented beggars in rags on the stage?

¹See Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome*, 22-23 (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1932). His argument rests directly on Aristophanes.

²Roy C. Flickinger, *The Greek Theater and Its Drama*, 325 (University of Chicago Press, 1926).

³Homer's *Odyssey*, Edited by W. Walter Merry and James Riddell, I, note on 4.245 (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1886).

I presume it was his continued use of this device, and the extreme realism of their appearance. Aristophanes refers to the rags of Oeneus, Phoenix, Philoctetes, Bellerophon, Thyestes, Telephus, and Ino.

We may refer not only to stories from Homer and Herodotus as precursors of Euripides's ragged heroes. Aeschylus, too, belongs in the tradition, for Xerxes at the end of the Persians appears in pitiful, ragged costume. I should be tempted to say that Sophocles in his Philoctetes (409 B. C.) was influenced by Euripides. There is mention of Philoctetes's rags and his generally wretched condition. By this time, perhaps, rags on the stage had become a commonplace. Euripides had blazed the trail of realistic portraiture.

II. A FAVORITE TYPE OF PLOT

Decharme², closely following the thought of Aristotle, writes of the various dramatic situations that find place in the pages of Euripides, of terror and pity, of admiration. Euripides was fond of terrible situations, he says, and Aristotle was right in declaring that his plays rarely end happily³. This is a very peculiar statement! Aristotle says that many of his plays end unhappily. Furthermore, Decharme clearly contradicts himself. He says elsewhere⁴:

We see how varied are the forms of happy endings in Euripides. "The most tragic of poets" did not always seek for the most terrible and startling effects at the close of his dramas; but, following the example of Aeschylus and Sophocles, he chose subjects—perhaps more frequently than they—which enabled him to give the spectators that sort of satisfaction which we feel at the end of a play when those are saved from death for whose fate we have long despaired and trembled. Aristotle, of course, is right, and Decharme is right. Decharme is repeating what Aristotle says—in spite of the apparent contradiction.

Let us try to interpret an old passage in a new way. Aristotle (Poetics 13.6) is insisting that the unhappy ending is the right ending. He says that Euripides has been unjustly censured because many of his plays end unhappily. Then he proceeds. I wonder if we dare render the famous passage in this way: 'Euripides, even if at times he does not order his house well, still seems to be the most tragic of the poets'. Aristotle has been talking about happy and unhappy endings. Can it not be that he means just this, that Euripides too often appeals to his audience by the use of the happy ending—but yet at his best is the most tragic of the poets? The tendency has been, I believe, to refer to Euripides's faultiness in the episodic structure of some of his plays⁵. But it seems to me that the contrast here is clearly drawn between the unhappy and the happy ending. Aristotle continues⁶:

In the second rank comes the kind of tragedy which some place first. Like the Odyssey, it has a double thread of plot, and also an opposite catastrophe for the good and for the bad. It is generally thought to

be the best owing to the weakness of the spectators; for the poet is guided in what he writes by the wishes of his audience. The pleasure, however, thence derived is not the true, tragic pleasure. It is proper rather to Comedy. . . .

I think we must not overlook a salient fact, that Euripides anticipated our modern idea of a good play—I mean a play with plenty of desperate situations which nevertheless ends happily. After all, the end is most important. Nowadays we expect a play to end happily. We are nevertheless distressed at moments of great danger or uncertainty. The intensity of our joy and relief are obviously in proportion to the hazards experienced by the hero. I should be inclined to term such a play sensational. Euripides certainly was fond of this type. More particularly we might say that he had a predilection for the situation in which a kinsman is about to be slain unwittingly.

The Cresphontes is a notable example of this type. Decharme⁷ gives an account of it and others under the heading of the dramatic situation of terror. I should prefer to emphasize the reversal from terror to happiness. Aristophanes ridiculed the Telephus and the Andromeda. It remained for Stephen Leacock⁸ to satirize a type of play like Cresphontes!

III. EURIPIDES'S TREATMENT OF HOMERIC CHARACTERS

The characters of Euripides have not the majestic aloofness of those of Aeschylus, nor yet the cold, hard, statuesque nature of the personages of Sophocles. Euripides's characters are seldom ideal in the sense that those of Aeschylus and Sophocles are. Even when they are romantic, they are closer to ordinary humanity. In fact, romantic rather than ideal is an appropriate description of one side of Euripides's portrayal of character. Of this we shall speak again. His realism is more often dwelt upon⁹.

The effect of Euripides's realistic technique on the characters of Homer is most interesting. Euripides does something to his characters which makes them different from Homer's. Just what is this difference? Andrew Lang, combating a certain view of Achilles which termed him a splendid savage, says¹⁰:

If our critics studied him as Shakespearian students examine Hamlet or Macbeth, it is improbable that they could think the wrath of Achilles "a second-rate subject." It does not appear to me that his wrath about "a personal slight"—the loss of Briseis, is a fit of the sulks; that Achilles, as was said of Byron in one of his portraits, looks like "a great sulky schoolboy whom somebody has deprived of a plum-cake".

He goes on to explain that Achilles is the son of a goddess, the recognized hero of the whole Achaean array, a youth who is giving up his life on the plains of Troy for the sake of immortal renown. But he has been on every occasion dishonored by Agamemnon. This is no unworthy cause of wrath.

²Paul Decharme, *Euripides and the Spirit of His Dramas*, Translated by James Loeb, 185 (New York, Macmillan, 1906).

³Aristotle, *Poetics* 13 (= 1453a 25).

⁴Decharme, 261-262 (see note 3, above).

⁵Gilbert Norwood, *Greek Tragedy*, 312 (Boston, John W. Luce and Co., 1920).

⁶I give Butcher's translation. See S. A. Butcher, *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art* (London, Macmillan, 1895).

⁷Decharme, 179-180 (see note 3, above).

⁸Nonsense Novels, *Caroline's Christmas or the Inexplicable Incident*, 179-201 (New York, Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1923).

⁹Reference may be made here to Professor Mierow's paper, *The Trend of Euripidean Criticism*, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 29.9-11, C. K. >.

¹⁰Andrew Lang, *The World of Homer*, 246 (London, Longmans, 1910).

What Lang says is, of course, true, but is this splendid apology necessary? I think that, when we read Homer, we are really in no great danger of feeling that Achilles is showing poor sportsmanship. The exalted character of the language at once lifts us above such pettiness. Mackail, comparing the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, awards the palm to the *Iliad* because it is, as it were, hammered out at white heat⁹. This nobility and this intensity lift the Homeric characters into a higher realm; the wrath of Achilles is magnificent wrath! Achilles can swear at Agamemnon and cast his scepter on the ground, but still the atmosphere is high and rare and ideal. 'So surely as this scepter shall not put forth leaves nor ever bloom again, so surely shall longing for Achilles come upon the sons of the Achaeans' is high language, and it has inspired other sublime poetry.

Homer's style is ideal. The style of Aeschylus and Sophocles also is ideal. It is not easy to say just what factors make a presentation realistic, or what factors make a presentation ideal, but we are seldom in doubt as to the type. When we read the *Iphigeneia* at Aulis, we can scarcely refrain from smiling at the portrayal of Achilles. Here is the "great sulky schoolboy". He would not have minded if the Greeks had used his name to lure Iphigeneia to the camp to be sacrificed. But he has been offended by being left out of the secret that Iphigeneia had been brought to Aulis by the offer of marriage to him. It is the way in which it is all said that here conveys the impression of a spoiled youth who refuses to play because he thinks he is insulted. Euripides has presented Achilles in an exaggerated realistic fashion. Sophocles represented men as they ought to be, Euripides not as they are, but as a trifle worse than that. The Athenian audience must have been shocked at this extreme of realism, and no doubt pleased and amused. It is almost farcical. If we read the *Rhesus*, we find Hector a braggart, and Rhesus a mere repetition of Hector¹⁰. The treatment is similar to that of Achilles in the *Iphigeneia* at Aulis. Euripides tried to look at these heroes as they actually were, and in presenting them realistically he intentionally exaggerated their weaker points. In like manner the quarrel of Pheres and Admetus in the *Alcestis* must have shocked and amused the audience. Also the Helen, in making use of the real and the counterfeit Helen, is in this respect farcical. If Euripides sought to appeal to the populace in this way, he did it early and late. But perhaps he enjoyed trying different techniques and presenting contradictory attitudes.

Let us look at some other Homeric characters in Euripides. Agamemnon very properly and very truly reflects the age in which he lived, a time of limited monarchy¹¹. Here is no dictator, but a king who must listen to the advice of the other princes. This fact is reflected in his somewhat wavering attitude. We find this same uncertainty in Aeschylus. Agamemnon does not wish to be received by Clytemnestra as an Eastern potentate, yet he weakly allows himself to be led up

the gorgeous 'purple' carpet, to his doom. Euripides gives us a similar picture of Agamemnon in the *Iphigeneia* at Aulis, sending for his daughter, trying to recall his message, afraid of his wife, afraid of losing prestige with the army, vacillating now this way, now that. But Euripides's picture is closer to everyday life than Homer's or Aeschylus's.

Andrew Lang says¹²:

... The foil to Agamemnon, the good Menelaus, the kindest and most chivalrously honourable of men, always conscious of his debt to the Achaeans, always eager to dare beyond his strength, is a worthy pendant. Odysseus throughout the poem is the poet's most admired hero; the wisest and most steadfast, here as in the *Odyssey*...

It is interesting to observe the metamorphosis Menelaus and Odysseus undergo in Greek tragedy. To be sure, we can understand why Euripides should present Menelaus as the most despicable of men without any fine qualities. At the time of the Peloponnesian War Spartans would not be generally popular at Athens. Euripides might easily appeal to his audience by presenting a Spartan in the most lurid colors. In one play, however, the Helen, Euripides depicts Menelaus as well as Helen in the most pleasing style, as romantic hero and heroine. Because the play is so totally romantic and far away from ordinary events and ordinary atmosphere, he can afford to portray these characters as ideal mythical beings and entirely forget for the moment the hated Spartan. The Helen was written in 412 after the Sicilian Expedition, at a time when men were no doubt glad to forget the terrible present and to wander off into the realms of charming romance. Aristophanes's *Birds*, too, reflects this desire to flee far from the din and the turmoil of this feverish life into a happy other world.

In the *Orestes*, where all the characters are degraded to the level of middle class personages, Menelaus appears at his worst, and Helen is presented as a silly coquette. Electra observes that, when she would offer a lock of hair at the tomb of her father, she is careful merely to clip the ends of her hair so as not to impair her beauty.

How Odysseus acquired the evil character which he usually exhibits in Greek tragedy is not so easy to explain. No doubt it is a rationalizing process, or a tendency toward a more realistic portrayal whereby his craftiness is reduced to mean cunning. The most interesting point to notice is that in Sophocles's *Aias* Odysseus is distinctly fine, noble, and generous toward an opponent in disaster. 'I pity him', he says, 'for I see that we are but shades, all we who live, and fleeting phantoms'. Here is a heroic, kindly philosopher¹³. But, when we see him once more in the *Philoctetes*, he is no longer fine. On the contrary, he restrains the noble instincts of Neoptolemus and compels him to carry out the mean plot. What has happened? Is it fanciful to

⁹*Ibidem*, 250.

¹⁰Professor John A. Scott, *The Unity of Homer*, 196 (University of California Press, 1921), says, "... In the *Ajax* of Sophocles this same Odysseus is pictured as an lago of villainy who brought about the madness and suicide of the great Ajax, son of Telamon. ... This distresses me, for the impression I have is quite different. Odysseus may indeed be the ultimate cause of Ajax's downfall, but does not Sophocles present him in a noble light?

¹¹J. W. Mackail, *Lectures on Greek Poetry*, 55-56 (London, Longmans, 1911).

¹²Wilhelm Christ, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, Sixth Edition, Revised by Wilhelm Schmid, 377 (Munich, Beck, 1912).

¹³Lang, *The World of Homer*, 250, 24 (see note 8, above).

suppose that Sophocles has been affected by Euripides and that here we see an Odysseus who is more distinctly of the Euripidean type? Or must we say that the exigencies of the plot of the *Philoctetes* demand this treatment?

If we were to try to generalize regarding Euripides, we would no doubt fall into difficulties because of the manifold character of his writing and his interest. He enjoys many kinds of plot and many kinds of character and many modes of treatment. But the general effect is this: he realizes his characters as human beings, sometimes to an excessive degree, so that they become humorous or farcical. With him the ideal atmosphere often turns into the light of common day. Yet we must never forget that he can and does portray romantic characters. These, too, are humanly realized so that they are capable of being humanly appreciated. This is, of course, a source of Euripides's popularity in antiquity as in modern times. I must confess that sometimes Aeschylus is a little too lofty for me and Sophocles frequently a little too cold and too hard. But in Euripides we have romance, idealism, and realism. In his pictured pages we see a stately throng, attractive by their very variety: romantic Phaedra, dying for love, selfish Admetus and the selfish Pheres, youthful Iphigeneia, now afraid of death, now gloriously dedicating herself for the fatherland, austere Hippolytus with his unhappy, importunate father.

THE COLORADO COLLEGE,
COLORADO SPRINGS,
COLORADO

HERBERT EDWARD MIEROW

REVIEW

Homer and Mycenae. By Martin P. Nilsson. London: Methuen and Company (1933). Pp. xii, 283. 52 Illustrations, 4 Maps¹.

In a conversation at which I was present recently the question whether the problem of Homer would ever be solved was answered with the words, "Yes, within a few years". The speaker was prepared to mean both that the Homeric Question would be answered by the year 1940, and also that Homer's date would soon be fixed within narrow limits.

If this prophecy comes true, a share of the credit will be due to Professor Martin P. Nilsson's book, *Homer and Mycenae*. In this book Professor Nilsson faces the great difficulty of Homeric research, which is in the large number of mutually dependent uncertainties involved. He makes successful progress by means of a carefully planned method of convergent inferences.

The background of Professor Nilsson's work, as he

¹I esteem it a high privilege to be able to lay before the readers of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* Mr. Knight's review of an important book, Martin P. Nilsson, *Homer and Mycenae*. Twice before Mr. Knight has put students of the Classics deeply in debt to him by publishing in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* reviews which were the fruit not only of great labor, but of profound and wide-reaching scholarship: see his reviews of Carlo Buscarioli, *Il Libro di Didone* (= Vergil, *Aeneid* 4), 26.201-204, and of Edward Kennard Rand, *The Magical Art of Virgil*, 28.145-148.

In this review Mr. Knight has given a general account of the Homeric question, an account which ought to be of interest to all readers of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*.

It would be a great gain to classical scholarship if reviews of this type were to become the rule rather than the exception in those classical periodicals which, because they are published in English, are most familiar to American classical students. C. K. >

himself remarks, is his research into the Mycenaean origin of Greek religion and myth. See his book, *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology*, Sather Classical Lectures, Volume Eight, 1932 (University of California Press, 1932). From this emerges a clear conception of the identity of the Mycenaean culture, and of its relation to the Hellenic. He has now proved, what has been growing more likely for some time, that the people of whom Homer tells are the bearers of the Mycenaean civilization, and that the Homeric Poems contain material handed down from times many centuries before the historical age begins. To effect his proof, he carefully distinguishes external evidence from the internal evidence of the poems, that a preconceived view of the Homeric Question may not distort historical judgment.

I now describe the argument of the book^{1a}. I shall confine my criticisms to the footnotes of this review.

In Chapter I, Views and Methods in the Homeric Question (1-55), there is a masterly account of the history of Homeric controversy². First the Separatists, then the Unitarians, who are said to have been forced into their position by the Separatists, are criticized. Both sides have exaggerated. Theories of the Separatists are clearly distinguished as the "little lay theory," the "nucleus theory", and the "compilation theory," on which traces of the other two were left. A modified Separatism, such as that of Wilamowitz, is easier to understand than extreme Unitarianism such as that of Drerup, which "exalts Homer on a lonely pedestal" (33); but on the whole the views of Unitarians are sounder. Perhaps the strongest praise is given to Professor John A. Scott (33-34); and the sternest criticism is directed against Professor Bethe (11, 13, 16, 49-51)³. Nevertheless, the outlook of this

^{1a}The contents of the book are as follows: Preface (vii-viii); <Table of> Contents (ix-x); List of Illustrations and Maps (xi-xii); I, Views and Methods in the Homeric Question (1-55); II, The History of the Mycenaean Age (56-118); III, Datable Elements of Civilization in Homer (119-159); IV, Homeric Language and Style (160-183); V, The Origin and Transmission of Epic Poetry (184-211); VI, State Organization in Homer and in the Mycenaean Age (212-247); VII, Mythology in Homer (248-278); Index (279-283). In this review reference to pages in the book under review is made by numbers only without further designation.

Professor Nilsson's success in writing English, which is not, of course, his own language (he seems to write Swedish, German, and English with equal facility), in this as in his other books, commands admiration. His style even deserves to be imitated. He might, perhaps, have been helped by some one to remove a few Teutonisms, and other forms and usages that are not quite natural in English.

The highly compressed criticism of the views of so many earlier scholars is a very remarkable achievement. It was of course impossible to give a complete representation or discussion of them; and there is accordingly sometimes an impression that full weight is not given sympathetically to the arguments that have been advanced. This impression was, however, hardly to be avoided in most instances within the space available (but compare 57-58 [on Myres], 121 [on Evans]); readers should in any event be prepared to weigh for themselves evidence and arguments, especially in archaeological matters.

²Professor Nilsson says (5) that the view that, to create the Homeric Poems as we have them, disconnected poems were first collected in Athens, is nowadays hardly accepted by anyone except Cauer, though Bethe comes near to it in supposing (16) that the Homeric Poems were composed in Athens in the sixth century B. C. I think that Bethe, and partly Cauer, have more support from recently published work than would appear from Professor Nilsson's statements, and that a tendency to return to their views may soon be more evident. There is some good criticism of Bethe (49-51), especially on the ground that he confused the development of poetry with the development of myth. But further reply is needed to Bethe's impressive theory. For example, the strongest evidence for the existence of a ruling house of Aeneidae at Scyros should be required. Later (212-213) Professor Nilsson explains why the reference to the House of Erechtheus in *Odyssey* 7.81 does not prove late Attic authorship; it refers to Mycenaean conditions in Athens. He might also have explained why the procession to offer

chapter is conditioned by the opinions of German Separatists more than is usual in books printed in English; and the discussion is all the more salutary on this account, since there is still some tendency to over-

a robe to Athena at Troy in Iliad 5.298-303, which is used as an argument by Bethe (Erich Bethe, *Homer, Dichtung und Sage, Zweiter Band: Odyssee, Kyklos, Zeitbestimmung*, 314-320 [Leipzig, Teubner, 1922]), may also be remembered from Mycenaean times. There may well have been an Athena worshipped at Troy (see my remarks in Vergil's *Troy*, 105-154 [Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1932]), and my article, *Myth and Legend at Troy*, in *Folk-Lore* 46 (1935), 98-121. Again, Professor Nilsson (5, note 2) cites Cicero, *De Oratore* 3.137 as evidence for the collection at Athens of Homer's poems, scattered before, but he does not cite Pausanias 7.26.13. He is inclined to set aside this tradition as mere invention (5). This I think insufficient; I prefer the most obvious, but quite satisfactory, solution of the problem. If the Iliad and the Odyssey were in any sense 'composed' in Athens, from elements which were *confusa*, as Cicero says, and *διασπαρμένα*, according to Pausanias, this was certainly not the first construction of the poems. They had existed for generations as complete works, and probably still did so exist; but, when opportunity for the recital of such long poems became less, they may have tended in some places to fall apart, and some research may have been needed to secure a good text of every part of the whole Iliad and Odyssey for the Panathenaea. This might involve a process which, with a little exaggeration, could be called 'composition', in the sense of 'reconstruction'.

The main question here, not treated by Professor Nilsson, is, When and where are conditions favorable to the recitation and therefore the creation of such long poems likely to have existed? At the Panathenaea only parts seem to have been recited. The Cyclic Poems were designed on a scale suitable for such recitation, the Homeric Poems were not. It is only to be supposed that conditions were different at some obscure moment of history on the Asiatic coast. Apparently the Iliad and the Odyssey had come to be recited only in separate parts, not very long. But in Athens a return was made to the older habit of reciting, if not the whole poems, at least very large parts of them. That is a possible reason why Peisistratus or some one else, not always being able to depend on good complete texts, may have felt obliged to have texts of parts of the poems collected and edited; and also why there is emphasis on recital by successive rhapsodes, each beginning where another had left off, for example in Diogenes Laertius 1.2.9, whose phrase is *ἐξ ὑποβολῆς*, and in Pseudo-Plato, *Hippiarchus*, 228 B, whose words are *ἐξ ὑπολήψεως*. The words of Cicero, *De Oratore* 3.137, *Pisistratus primus Homeri libros, confusos antea, sic disposuisse dicitur ut nunc habemus, need not, I think, mean more than what I suppose to be the truth; if at first sight they seem to suggest an original construction, by combination of elements never before united, this is easily explained by the slightly exaggerating tone of the passage of Cicero in which they occur; the context of such notices must never be disregarded. Pausanias (7.26.13) expresses the facts more accurately: *Πεισίστρατος ἔφη τὰ Ὀμήρου διασπαρμένα τε καὶ ἀλλὰχοῦ μνημονεύμενα θύραις* (the addition of *ἀλλὰ* before *ἀλλὰχοῦ* is an emendation). His words say that the poems were by Homer, that they had become disintegrated (not that they had *always* existed apart), and that they were preserved in memory elsewhere than at Athens (not that there had existed, as many separate whole poems in many different places, the parts from which the Iliad and the Odyssey were now 'composed'). This interpretation, as Professor Nilsson might perhaps have said, is more natural to the Greek than is Professor Bethe's.*

Some further discussion of this matter was desirable, because Professor John A. Scott, in his brilliant book, *The Unity of Homer* (Berkeley, California, The University of California Press, 1921), does not quote the passage in Cicero (*De Oratore* 3.137). On page 57 he merely alludes to the passage (without giving the reference), and then writes, "... No later writer adds any detail which proves a new source of knowledge. ... connecting the Homeric Poems with Peisistratus. He adds (58), 'There is no evidence for this Homeric recension under the supervision of Peisistratus but the evidence of probabilities. ...', probabilities which he proceeds most successfully to disprove. A reexamination is wanted, if the balance between Professor Scott and Professor Bethe is to be rightly held. But not much needs to be added to the fine discussion by F. O. Welcker, *Der Epische Cyclos*, 1.351-364 (Bonn, Eduard Weber's Verlag, 1865 [the first edition appeared in 1835]), a work still cited, but scarcely read as much as it should be.

Professor Nilsson has, of course, hardly space to mention the cyclic epic; but it is not easy to give an account of the Homeric Question without reference to it. This is true for several reasons. The cyclic epic contains early material, but it is later than Homer's poetry. However, much even of the cyclic epic belongs to the seventh century. Homer therefore must come before that time, and the middle of the eighth century is a satisfactory date for him. Now Bethe's arguments for a very late composition of the Iliad and the Odyssey depend on the possibility of bringing down the dates of the cyclic epic, and to do this he sharply, but, in my opinion unfairly, criticizes the ancient notices concerning the epic cycle. Any answer to Bethe should, if possible, meet his arguments concerning the epic cycle.

It would also be easy to show that notices about the epic cycle presuppose that the cycle contained material which Homer also knew, and this might have been useful in establishing the principle that Homer used, altered, and readapted and combined older material. Compare on this and similar questions a little known work

look the difficulties of Unitarianism, which have been emphasized sharp-sightedly by the Germans, but minimized by others, especially Andrew Lang. The right view is a sane and modern Unitarianism, which makes the best use of all that the Separatists have suggested.

The criticism of Separatists and Unitarians is continued in Chapter II, *The History of the Mycenaean Age* (56-118), to show that the right method is to interpret first all the evidence apart from the Homeric Poems themselves, and to consider the Poems only after this has been done, that circular arguments may be avoided. The method is of course right, and the main thesis of this chapter, that the bearers of the Mycenaean civilization were Greeks, and that they were of the tribes to which the heroes of the Homeric Poems belonged⁴, is triumphantly established. The Mycenaean civilization was not imposed on Greece by conquerors from Crete, but was due to Greeks who had invaded Greece from the North, raided Crete, and brought back elements of culture which they assimilated and blended with other elements of Northern origin. The proof of this is derived mainly from differences between the Minoan and the Mycenaean civilizations. There are Northern elements, not to be derived from Crete, in Greece: the *megaron* house, Northern dress, the *fibula*, amber, commoner in early than in late Mycenaean

by F. A. Paley, *On Quintus Smyrnaeus and the "Homer" of the Tragic Poets* (Cambridge, printed by J. Palmer [for private distribution: no publisher is given], 1876), where some truth is disguised by bad method.

Lastly, there should be some consideration of the structure of the Iliad, which agrees with geometric principles of design. Compare J. T. Sheppard, *The Pattern of the Iliad* (London, Methuen, 1922), John Linton Myres, *Who Were the Greeks?*, Chapter VIII, *passim*, and note 112, on pages 604-605 (Sather Classical Lectures, Volume Six, 1929, University of California Press, 1930), and an article by Professor Myres, *The Last Book of the Iliad: Its Place in the Structure of the Poem*, *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 52 (1932), 265-296.

⁴That the Mycenaeans were Greeks, speaking an Indo-European language, who forced their way among a pre-Hellenic population, speaking a language which was not Indo-European, and that, in contrast with the Mycenaeans, the Minoans were of pre-Greek stock, and not Indo-European in language, is an approximately true statement, but it is an abbreviated and simplified expression. The argument (65) that, if the Minoans had spoken Greek, their written records would have been interpreted before now, is not quite sound as it stands, for there exists an (admittedly hypothetical) interpretation of the records, which assumes that the language is early Greek: Miss F. Melian Stawell, *A Clue to the Cretan Scripts* (London, Bell, 1931). This interpretation has not been generally accepted, but principally on the ground that there is no reason to think the language Greek at all, rather than because it is impossible to read the Minoan documents as if written in Greek.

The Minoan culture has been thought to show already some Indo-European influence; compare Fritz Schachermeyr, *Etruskische Frühgeschichte* (Berlin and Leipzig, De Gruyter, 1929), on pages 233-252, and in the Index, under *Frühindogermanische Einflüsse*. It is held that there are signs of Indo-Germanic language in Lydian and Lycian, and probably also in Etruscan and in the speech of the "pre-Greek" population of Greece, and accordingly that three layers of population must be distinguished, one not Indo-Germanic, another, 'proto-Indo-Germanic', which belongs to the time of the Minoan culture, and a third, formed by the arrival of Hellenes in Greece. Compare also Paul Kretschmer, *Die Protoindogermanische Schicht*, *Glotta* 14 (1925), 300-319, especially 302. His results are used by Schachermeyr.

Nor is it altogether safe to argue from the names in the myths, of which most are Greek, and very few certainly pre-Greek, as Rhadamanthys and Hyacinthos are, that the myths originated purely among Greeks (81). It is quite possible for the names of a myth to be changed, sometimes by translation or Hellenization, though the form of the myth is little altered. Compare Schachermeyr, 21, 253-254, and note 12, below. Schachermeyr (21, 254) is one of those who, in contrast with Professor Nilsson, hold that many names in Greek myth are pre-Greek.

In connection with un-Greek names in myth, it might have been observed (81, and elsewhere) that *Rhadamanthys* can be plausibly derived from the Egyptian *Ra ammenthes* or *Ra amment*, 'Ra (or god) of the world of the dead in the West' (R. Hennig, *Die Geographie des Homerischen Epos*, 50 [Leipzig, Teubner, 1934]).

times and rare in Crete, the boar's tusk helmet, writing, rare on the mainland, as if practised there with difficulty by people less civilized than the Cretans, the earlier appearance there of the horse, a difference in religion, which is more emotional and mystical among the pre-Greek peoples, the preponderance of Greek names in myth, and the scale of artistic work, larger among Mycenaeans than among Minoans⁸. The archaeological evidence offers two breaks in culture which may mean the first arrival of Greeks, one between the Early and the Middle Hellenic periods, and another between the Middle and the Late. If the Greeks came in the first break, they waited four centuries before signs of contact with Crete appear; but amber is found at the very beginning of the Mycenaean Age. The Greek dialects are shown by their nature and distribution to have been differentiated before the migration. The Ionians preceded the Achaeans. With the arrival of the Achaeans, between Late Minoan II and Minoan III, the final destruction of the palace at Knossos and the collapse of Minoan civilization may be connected (96)⁹. The Ahhiyava of the Hittite documents are

⁸In showing (72-75) that the *megaron* type of house is Northern and cannot be derived from Crete Professor Nilsson might have raised the question of the name *megaron*. It has usually been supposed to be a Semitic word, and it may be the same as *magalia*, *mapalia*, Latin names for houses in Africa. Perhaps, then, a northern architectural plan was permanently called by a Southern name. It so, the inferences from this should be taken into consideration.

Concerning the practice of writing in Mycenaean Greece, Professor Nilsson argues (78-79) that it is rare because writing is difficult for more barbarous conquerors to acquire. He cites Theodor, who could not write; he might have added William the Conqueror. He seems to accept too readily Professor Persson's interpretation of the inscription from Asine (79). The latest investigations seem to show that the Greek alphabet was adopted at least as early as the ninth century B. C.: compare B. L. Ullman, *How Old is the Greek Alphabet?* *The American Journal of Archaeology* 38 (1934), 358-381, and Dr. John Day's review, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 28 (1934), 65-69, 73-80, of Professor Rhys Carpenter's book, *The Humanistic Value of Archaeology* (Harvard University Press, 1933). The earlier use of writing, in Mycenaean Greece, is fairly clear, though there are uncertainties; but probably, as Professor Nilsson thinks, the use of writing for long poems did not begin early. Professor Nilsson argues (79-80) that, though it is always said that the horse came to Crete from the Orient, where it appears at the beginning of the second millennium B. C., it is most probable that the horse was introduced directly by way of Europe into Greece. Surely, however, the view that the horse was brought into Greece and Crete from the North is not unusual. The first appearance of the horse in the Orient should now be dated about 3100 or 3000 B. C. from seals found at Susa, contemporary with the first Awan dynasty; compare R. de Mecquenem, *Excavations at Susa (Persia)*, *Antiquity* 5 (1931), 330-343, especially 331-332, and Figure 1 on page 351. This whole question is, however, at present most uncertain.

The distinction between the pre-Greek religion, more emotional and mystical, and the Greek, Northern religion, with a more anthropomorphic theology (80), should not be too sharply drawn. The Egyptian sky gods are, more and more clearly, comparable to the Greek weather God Zeus. Compare G. A. Wainwright, *Some Aspects of Amūn*, *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 20 (1934), 139-153. That the stone ax found at Asine can only mean the thunderbolt, and can be taken as the first indication of a worship of Zeus (80) is surely most uncertain. For the origin and the meaning of stone axes see Hermann Güntert, *Labyrinth, Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philologisch-historische Klasse*, 1932/33, I. Abhandlung, especially 11, 16-17. This discussion puts this and many cognate questions in a new light. Compare also now F. Müller, Junior, *Studia ad Terrae Matris Cultum Pertinentia, Mnemosyne, Series 3*, 2 (1935), 37-50, 162-232, and the literature there cited.

I should not have thought it safe to say that the distribution of the different classes of *Abulae* is not fundamental (76). Compare John Linton Myres, *Who Were the Greeks?*, 405-425 (see note 3, above).

Since Professor Nilsson's interpretations of material objects have been discussed by other reviewers, I make no further comment on them, except to say that the interesting innovation (81) by which the stone slabs at Dendra are identified with 'Menhirs' of Central Europe claims a mention, and needs, perhaps, more argument, and comparison of stone objects elsewhere.

⁹In reconstructing the history of the Mycenaean Age Professor Nilsson makes progress in spite of great difficulties. He has not, of course, space to discuss all the difficulties fully. I think he is

Achaeans (104), who are shown, in spite of the uncertainty of some of the identifications of Hittite names, to have held a great empire in Greece. The Danauna (107-108) and the Lukki (105) of Egyptian records are Danai and Lycii; other identifications are doubtful. But it is clear that Mycenaean Greeks raided Egypt in the thirteenth century, and it was apparently after their failures there that they attacked Troy⁷.

Professor Nilsson returns to Homer in Chapter III, *Datable Elements of Civilization in Homer* (119-159). The Unitarians date Homer himself at a transitional period, about 1100 B. C., and suppose that the composite civilization of the Homeric Poems really existed then. Such an age is imaginary. The Separatists rightly

much too ready to reject the results of Professor Myres's researches into the Greek heroic genealogies (58, 60). These researches (John Linton Myres, *Who Were the Greeks?*, 291-366) show that the Greek folk-memory is in general coherent, and agrees with other evidence. There are plenty of parallels for folk-memory which is comparatively accurate, although chronology may always be confused. The Maori folk-memory goes back to the thirteenth century, and was till recently of practical use. Professor Myres can show by his scheme where and when the "divine born dynasties" first appeared in the heroic age of Greece (308-312, and elsewhere), a question which Professor Nilsson might profitably have discussed, to reinforce his theory of two waves of Achaean immigrants, one after Late Minoan II, and one two hundred years later (95-97). There should at least be some reference to the folk-memory of such movements which has been preserved.

In the same connection Professor Myres's account of the Ionians (364-365, and elsewhere), in which he suggests that the marked difference between Ionic and other dialects may be due to a much longer association of Ionic with pre-Greek languages in Greece, might also have been used; and it might have been worth while to analyze further the possibility suggested by Professor Myres's scheme (364-365) that there may be an ascertainable relation between "Minyan ware" or "grey ware" pottery and the Ionians (83-84; compare 96, where it is said that the Minyans may be Ionians). Professor Nilsson deprecates too much inference from pottery concerning race and culture (83); but he is inclined at times to disregard this principle himself (67-68; compare also 63, and note 1). In general, he might well have compared the Achaean culture with the Bohemian bronze age, to which it has a very significant likeness.

In dealing with Hittite and Egyptian evidence for the Achaeans Professor Nilsson is cautious in accepting the identifications of names which have been proposed, but he avoids extreme scepticism (102-109). He admits that the Ahhiyava of Hittite records are Achaeans; but against his doubts on mythological grounds (104) of the transliterations Andrus and Eteclees (earlier Eteklees) should be set the explanation of Professor Myres (327-331, and elsewhere). The equation Attarissiyas = Atrius may be phonetically impossible (104, and note 2); but, even if it is so, the alternative and attractive identification of this king with Perseus, proposed by the late Professor A. H. Sayce, *Perseus and the Achaeans in the Hittite Tablets*, *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 45 (1925), 161-163 (compare his article, *The Aryan Problem—Fifty Years Later*, *Antiquity* 1 (1927), 204-215, especially 206), should have been considered. The spelling "Menepthah" (106) of the name of the Egyptian king is an impossible transliteration of the hieroglyphics which present this name. The name is surely *Merneptah*. The spelling "Menepthah" is, Mr. G. A. Wainwright kindly informs me, an old mistake. Professor Nilsson might have accepted (105) the equation of the name Vilusha, which appears in Hittite records, with *Ῥιούα*, in view of the remarks of Paul Kretschmer, *Die Hypachäer*, *Glotta* 21 (1933), 251-252 (compare also Nilsson, 97, 99).

The Turasha, Shakalasha, and Shardina of Egyptian records (106) might now with more confidence be equated with Tyrrhenians, Siculi, and Sardi of Sardinia, especially since it is becoming more probable that the eastern and the western parts of the Mediterranean were in close touch by sea at early dates. This has been shown in particular by Ludolf Maltén, *Aineias, Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 29 (1931), 33-59, an article cited for a different point by Professor Nilsson (47, note 2), though he hardly recognizes the close connection between parts of the Mediterranean as much as I should expect. The discoveries in Sicily need not mean merely trade (97). Compare my paper, *Aeneas and History*, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 65 (1934), xxxiv (in the "Proceedings"). I would also suggest that Professor Nilsson overlooks the earlier of the appearances of the Shardina in Egyptian records (107), and might have said whether he thinks the Yevanna Ionians, a belief now widely discredited. The Zakaray (133) are often identified with Teukroi. As for the lack of myths concerning the sea raids on Egypt (113), I would suggest that, since few of the raiders returned from Egypt to bring news home, there was not much to give a basis for myth, and also that the effect of eating the lotus (at first probably a motive of funerary folklore from the East) may at one time have been used as an explanation why no news came.

think that the elements of civilization mentioned by Homer are of widely different times; but they wrongly regard these elements as revealing stratification in the Homeric Poems. A wrong method is used, the attempt to prove either that all datable elements in Homer are Mycenaean, or that they are all geometric. The right method is to admit the truth, that there are elements of many ages. The brooch of Odysseus and the cuirass of Agamemnon (124-125) are of the Geometric or Orientalizing Age, to which also belong mentions of Phoenicians, iron weapons, and the Ionian armature. To the Mycenaean Age belong such things as the cup of Nestor (137) and the Mycenaean armature, with the long shield (142-143); though an armature like the Ionian, with a round shield, existed in Late Mycenaean times (145), and helped the confusion in the Homeric epic. Burial customs are mainly of the Geometric Age, when cremation was in use (154); but Mycenaean rites of sacrifice have been combined, as at the funeral of Patroclus (154-156). The political geography, for example, of the Kingdom of Nestor is Mycenaean (157). These elements may be found anywhere. They are not stratified; and early elements and late may occur together in the same context*.

(To be Concluded)

BLOXHAM SCHOOL,
NEAR BANBURY, OXFORDSHIRE,
ENGLAND

W. F. J. KNIGHT

*Though Lang may have gone too far in thinking that a theory of a composite, transitional culture between the ages of bronze and iron will account for all the discordant elements in Homer's cultural background (119-121), it would have been better to mention those sites where these ages seem to meet at a transitional time, especially Halos (see A. J. B. Wace and M. S. Thompson, *Excavations at Halos*, Annual of the British School at Athens, 18 [1911-1912], 1-29); and perhaps also the occurrence of iron in Syria about 1100 B. C. The principle that the Homeric Poems need not fully correspond with any single historical age is certainly sound; but there is still much room for uncertainty in details, as Professor Nilsson admits. Evidence for the correspondence of much in Homer with the early historical period accumulates. It is now possible to fix the dates at which cremation became common as the eighth and the seventh centuries (see Miss H. L. Lorimer, *Pulvis et Umbra*, The Journal of Hellenic Studies 53 [1933], 161-180). On the other hand, proof of cremation at Hisarlik in the bronze age has suddenly and unexpectedly been found: compare Carl W. Blegen, *Excavations at Troy*, 1934, The American Journal of Archaeology 39 (1935), 6-34, especially 26-30.

Every year minor archaeological discoveries emphasize more the correspondence of regular Homeric armature with the armature of the eighth and the seventh centuries. Professor Nilsson judiciously decides that the round shield in Homer belongs to the early historic age; but he is careful to admit that the earlier round shield, known from the Warrior Vase, from Egyptian pictures of the Shardinia, and from the Phaistos Disk, may have been confused in some passages with the later round shield (142-150). I think he exaggerates (149-150) the difficulty raised by Tyrtæus (Fragment 11, Bergk), who mentions a shield which covers thighs, legs (*κνήμια*; surely better translated by 'shins'), breast, and shoulders, in supposing that such a shield must have been of the old long kind, or else that Tyrtæus's words are "a literary cliché not corresponding to the actual custom of the time". It is probable that Tyrtæus refers to the drill movement, by which a shield was handled to cover different parts of the body: compare Iliad 7.238-239. The evidence of the vase paintings is of course a different matter. Two other points of detail may be mentioned: *χαλκός* is merely bronze, not 'copper' (141), and there is a paradoxical opinion that *δωρίς* means the old long shield, and *σάκος* the round shield.

It is of great interest that Professor Nilsson insists (147, 158) that there are references in Homer not only to the late Mycenaean Age, but also to the early Mycenaean Age, of the shaft graves.

In connection with the Phoenicians (134-136), Professor Nilsson's argument is involved in the difficulty of deciding whether the Homeric material concerning voyages on which the Odyssey depends goes back to the Mycenaean Age, or only to the later age of historical colonization. He decides in favor of the later 'historical' age. He argues that all the mentions of Phoenicians are found in the Odyssey and in the late parts of the Iliad (135-136). I do not think that this argument is legitimate on his principle, that early and late parts of Homeric poetry cannot be thus distinguished. This insecurity affects his judgment of the relation between the Iliad and the Odyssey. He thinks that the Odyssey is of a later gener-

SOUNDING BRASS

The glory of a notorious braggart of the age of Tiberius has shrunk to a brief notice in the Preface to Pliny's *Historia Naturalis* (§ 25) and a stray reference in Seneca, *Epistulae* 88.40. The culprit was a certain Apion, who boasted that he bestowed the boon of immortality upon those to whom he dedicated his works. The Emperor, with a satirical wit no less native to himself than to Rome, dubbed him *cymbalum mundi*, an expression which Pliny paraphrases by *proprie famae tympanum*, leaving no doubt of the meaning. Apion beat the drum of his own fame.

ation than the Iliad: the social organization, he holds, is different. There are sea-voyages, appropriate to the age of colonization, and Scheria in the Odyssey even recalls the characteristics of historic Greek colonies; and, besides, taste and interest are not the same in the two poems (137). Later (258), he writes that the Odyssean cycle of stories is post-Mycenaean, that is, developed after the end of the Mycenaean Age. In the first place, however, linguistic tests, once thought to show that the Odyssey is later than the Iliad, now tend to prove that it is of about the same date (compare 172). Secondly, the differences of style and interest may surely be the result of difference of themes, and, as may never be forgotten on Professor Nilsson's excellent principles, differences in the sources. Thirdly, the maritime material of the Odyssey is just as likely to come from the Mycenaean Age. This is indicated by the work of M. Victor Bérard, even though he is wrong in identifying with Phoenicians early seafarers more likely to have been Minoans or Mycenaeans. Nor is the comparison of Scheria with colonies decisive. Homer shows a knowledge of the western parts of the Mediterranean unlikely in the early historic age: compare now R. Hennig, *Die Geographie des Homerischen Epos* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1934): see especially 24 (on early contacts), 32 (on early stories), 65-68 (on Scheria).

Elsewhere Professor Nilsson rejects the attempt of M. Victor Bérard "to find Phoenicians everywhere" (25). Here he will meet with assent, modified by the suggestion that there may be much truth in M. Bérard's theories, if they are adjusted to allow the substitution of Minoans for Phoenicians. Homer probably used material ultimately derived from Minoan sources, principally concerning voyages. Later (131-132), Professor Nilsson rejects the identification of Phoenicians with Minoans: for the authorities for this view and arguments in support of it compare A. Shewan, *Ithacan Origins*, *Classical Philology* 24 (1929), 335-346, especially 343. One of the arguments which Professor Nilsson uses is this: if the Phoenicians were Minoans, this would mean that Minoans visited mainland Greece rather than that Greeks from the mainland raided Crete. There is some risk here of a circular argument. The excavations at Ras-es-Shamra have, by the way, already proved that Phoenician was written in 1200 B. C.

There is grave difficulty in believing that the Iliad and the Odyssey are by different poets, and in thus duplicating the personality of Homer. Professor Nilsson meets the arguments of the Unitarians by admitting (209-210) that the Iliad was created by a single great poet, who organized former poetry, and composed new poetry, in subservience to his great design. Later, he remarks, "Another great genius appeared, the poet of the Odyssey..." (210). His name was universally remembered as Homer. If the memory of the Greeks is right as to the author of the Iliad, it is hard to see why, if another great poet had arisen to create the Odyssey, later than Homer, he should have been entirely forgotten. It is on the other hand perfectly credible that a single poet, at the end of a long succession of minstrels, imposed a practically final form on both poems. The differences between the poems can be explained by reference to differences between their sources, and perhaps to lapse of time, since Homer himself may well have continued to work on the Odyssey for twenty or thirty years after his work on the Iliad was virtually finished. Again, it is probable enough that Homer greatly advanced epic construction by a newly elaborate design and a psychological interest, that is, that one of the minstrels proved to have an exceptional and original genius. It is less likely that there were two such poets, and then no more; for the 'cyclic' poets, who composed their work after Homer and under his influence, seem to have been far behind Homer in greatness. Professor Scott comments well (54) on the famous notices in Aristotle, *Poetics* 8 and 23, on the superiority of Homer to the poets of the Epic Cycle.

This probability that the Iliad and the Odyssey are both the work of a single Homer seems to me to be one of the most secure results reached by Professor John A. Scott, who shows in particular (103-105) that the Iliad and the Odyssey were not only always until late times attributed by the Greeks to a single man, Homer, but also (see especially 11-38, 97, 105, and elsewhere) that a sharp distinction was made by them between the quality of the work of Homer, that is the Iliad and the Odyssey, and that of other epic poetry, which was never in early times attributed to Homer—a view contradicted, surprisingly, by Professor Felix Jacoby, *Homerisches*, *Hermes* 68 (1933), 17, and note 1. A further point is the complete difference, not only in quality but also in nature, between Homer's two poems and other early Greek epic (Scott, 34-36). For the almost certain attribution of both Iliad and Odyssey to one poet see also H. J. Rose, *A Handbook of Greek Literature*, 45 (London, Methuen, 1934).

The passages mentioned above and Horace, *Carmina* 1.18.13-16 illuminate one another. In Horace the raucous horn and the wild tambourines of Bacchus are specifically connected with egotism (*amor sui*), vain-glory, and treachery:

Saeva tene cum Berecynthio
cornu tympana, quae subsequitur caecus amor sui
et tollens vacuum plus nimio gloria verticem
arcanique fides prodiga, perlucidior vitro.

This parallel ought to be added to my interpretation of *cymbalon iuventutis* in *Catalepton* 5¹.

In 1 Corinthians 13.1 St. Paul speaks of "sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal" (or, as the Revised Version has it, "a clanging cymbal"), and follows with a sermon on brotherly love. It is a bit amazing that on this occasion the Apostle was taking his text from the Epicureans; the Epicureans, not the Stoics, based their practical ethics on love. If this is rare, the establishment of a connection between St. Paul and the Epicureans, it is no less novel to find an ode of Horace throwing light on one of St. Paul's Epistles.

VICTORIA COLLEGE,
TORONTO, CANADA

NORMAN W. DE WITT

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

X

The Saturday Review of Literature—October 5, Review, qualifiedly favorable, by Stephen V. Benét, of Harry Sackler, *Festival at Meron* ["an interesting and solid novel of Israel's last fighting attempt to free herself from Roman domination"]; October 26, Review, generally favorable, by Willard L. Sperry, of Arthur C. McGiffert, *A History of Christian Thought* (two volumes); November 23, Brief review, favorable, by F. J. M., of William D. Cox, *Boxing in Art and Literature*; December 7, Brief review, qualifiedly favorable, by E. D., of Grant Showerman, *Monuments and Men of Ancient Rome*; December 21, Review, unfavorable, by B. D., of George S. Hellman, *Persian Conqueror* [a "romance about Cyrus the Great... scarcely more than a retelling of the legendary biography given by Herodotus"]; December 28, Extended review, by Padraic Colum, qualifiedly favorable, of Helen Waddell, *Mediaeval Latin Lyrics*, uncritical, of Helen Waddell, *Beasts and Saints*, and, very favorable, of Christopher Dawson,

¹See my book, *Virgil's Biographia Litteraria*, 34 (London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, New York, Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1923).

Mediaeval Religion and Other Essays; Brief review, qualifiedly favorable, by D. P., of Agnes C. Vaughan, *Within the Walls* ["an imaginative but rather simple account of the siege and sack of Troy"].

School and Society—October 5, To Foreign Language Teachers and Professors of Education, Mildred Dean ["...improvement in enunciation is rarely achieved by practice in the vernacular. But practice in learning and using the beautiful wide vowels of the foreign languages, especially Latin, and the chance to learn the different sensations of open and closed throat, lay the foundation for self-improvement"]; Review, favorable, by William McAndrew, of T. R. Glover, *The Ancient World*; November 2, Brief review, uncritical, by William McAndrew, of R. S. Rogers, Kenneth Scott, and Margaret M. Ward, *Caesaris Augusti Res Gestae et Fragmenta*; December 7, Brief review, favorable, by William McAndrew, of Peter Hagboldt, *Language Learning*.

"Scientia"—October, Reviews, by G. Loria, favorable, of O. Neugebauer, *Vorlesungen Ueber die Geschichte der Antiken Mathematischen Wissenschaften*, I. Band: *Vorgriechische Mathematik*, and, qualifiedly favorable, of R. C. Archibald, *Outline of the History of Mathematics*; November, *Le Rôle de la Religion dans les Civilisations Prégrécoques*, Amelia Hertz; Reviews, very favorable, by F. Enriques, of William A. Heidel, *The Heroic Age of Science: The Conceptions, Ideals, and Methods of Science Among the Ancient Greeks*, and of J. C. Gregory, *Combustion from Heracleitus to Lavoisier*; Review, favorable, by A. Landry, of Van Groningen, *Aristote: Le Second Livre de l'Economique*; Review, very favorable, by A. M. Pizzagalli, of O. G. von Wesendonck, *Das Weltbild der Iranier*.

The South Atlantic Quarterly—October, The Modernity of the Ancients, Louis Pendleton ["The historians of the classic age appear to have been interested in the appearance as well as in the deeds of their subjects, not being content merely to note their achievements, number their crimes, and picture their follies. Plutarch <in his Lives>... is a notable example. His repeated reference to the personal appearance of his subjects is by itself sufficient evidence that such comment was by no means out of harmony with the literary habits of his age". Several personal descriptions selected from Plutarch's *Lives* are quoted in translation by way of illustration].

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY,
MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT

J. W. SPAETH, JR.